

### Remarks

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9-23 were pending in the Application. Claims 9,13 and 23 have been canceled. Claims 1, 7, 10 and 14 have been amended. Thus claims 1-4, 7, 10-12 and 14-22 are subject to continued examination.

### 35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action takes the position that in claims 1 and 7 the drawing temperature in degrees Celsius is new matter, as the specification discloses drawing temperature in degrees Fahrenheit. In claims 9 and 10, the heat setting temperature in degrees Celsius is new matter, as the specification discloses the heat setting temperature in degrees Fahrenheit.

Applicants note that claims 1, 7 and 10 have been amended in the manner set forth above to recite degrees Fahrenheit. Claims 9 and 13 have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of remaining claims 1-4, 7 and 10-12 as now presented should not be maintained.

Claims 2-4, 7, 9-11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

The Office Action takes the position that in claims 2 and 3, "step a" does not have antecedent basis because claim 1 does not positively recite a "step a".

Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended in the manner set forth above to include "step a" and thus the rejection of claims 2 and 3 should not be maintained.

The Office Action takes the position that claim 7 does not further limit the subject matter of claim 6 because claim 6 has been cancelled.

Applicants note that claim 7 has been amended in the manner set forth above to correctly recite its dependency from claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 7 as now presented should not be maintained.

The Office Action takes the position that in claims 9 and 10 "the heat setting temperature" does not have proper antecedent basis because claims 1, 2 and 4 do not positively recite a heat setting step.

Applicants note that claim 9 has been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of claim 9 moot. Claim 10 has been amended in the manner set forth so as to be presented in independent form. Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 10 as now presented should not be maintained.

The Office Action takes the position that in claim 10, it is not clear if this claim depends from claim 9 or claim 4 because the numeral "9" was added by amendment, but the numeral "4" does not appear to have been struck out.

Applicants note that claim 10 has been amended in the manner set forth so as to be presented in independent form. Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 10 as now presented should not be maintained.

The Office Action takes the position that in claim 11, "step b" does not have antecedent basis because claim 1 does not positively recite a "step b".

Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended in the manner set forth above to positively recite "step b". Thus, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 11 should not be maintained.

The Office Action takes the position that claim 13 does not further limit the subject matter of claim 5 because claim 5 has been canceled.

Applicants note that claim 13 has been canceled, thus rendering the rejection of claim 13 moot.

#### Obviousness Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujishita et al. (US 4,560,734) in combination with Inoue (JP 2001-081628). The Office Action takes the position that Fujishita teaches a process of making polypropylene tape fibers as set forth in the instant claims, except for the amount of nucleator compound. The Office Action looks to Inoue to provide this teaching.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art (MPEP § 2143.03). Applicants respectfully submit that Fujishita and Inoue do not teach a heat-setting step at a temperature that is in excess of the drawing temperature as presently

recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 14. This claim feature is supported in the specification at page 8, lines 17-19.

As best understood, Fujishita teaches a "relaxation heat treatment" which is carried out at the same temperature as that used for drawing. As best understood, neither of the prior art references teaches or suggests heat setting at a temperature in excess of the drawing temperature as claimed. Indeed, this high heat-set temperature would historically have been associated with high, and generally non-uniform, heat shrink characteristics, as described on page 3, lines 9-17 of the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use such high temperatures to "set" polypropylene tape fibers.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art references, when combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole. Accordingly, it is submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-4, 7 and 9-23 should not be maintained.

Conclusion:

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all remaining claims now stand in condition for allowance.


Should any issues remain after consideration of this Amendment and accompanying Remarks, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned in the hope that any such issue may be promptly and

satisfactorily resolved.

To any extent required for acceptance of this paper, an extension of time is hereby requested.

In the event that there are additional fees associated with the submission of these papers (including extension of time fees), authorization is hereby provided to withdraw such fees from Deposit Account No. 50-1424.

Respectfully submitted,



James M. Robertson  
Registration No. 36,905  
(864) 583-0030